UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,858	12/29/2000	Joseph M. Geigel	80677DMW	8939

7590 01/12/2006	EXAMINER
Thomas H. Close	NGUYEN, NHON D

Thomas H. Close
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/750,858	GEIGEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nhon (Gary) D. Nguyen	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 October 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-15 and 17-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-15 and 17-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

  1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

  2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

  3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/26/2005</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to amendment filed 10/26/2005.

2. Claims 1-15 and 17-32 are pending in this application. In this amendment, claims 16 and

33-36 are canceled, claims 1-8, 12, 14-15, 17, 18, 22, 24, and 27 are amended, and no claim is

added. This action is made non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-9 and 12-15, 17-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Koba (US 6,222,947) in view of Guttman et al. ("Guttman", US 6,366,918).

As per independent claim 1, Koba teaches a digital image album layout system

comprising:

a page creator module operable to receive a set of images and user preferences and to

generate album preference criteria using said user preferences, said page creator module having a

first program algorithm operable to execute calculations on a first population of image criteria,

said page creator module having a page evaluation module operable to test said first population

for fitness to said album preference criteria, said page creator module being operable to distribute

said images to a plurality of album pages responsive to said testing for fitness to said album

preference criteria (col. 6, lines 43-59) and

an image placement module operable to receive the set of images and user preferences

and to generate page preference criteria using said user preferences, said page creator module

having a second program algorithm operable to execute calculations on a second population of

page layout criteria, said image placement module having a layout evaluation module operable to

test said second population for fitness to said page preference criteria, said image placement

module being operable to distribute said images on respective said album pages responsive to

said testing for fitness to said preference criteria (col. 7, lines 37-41).

Koba does not disclose the first program algorithm and the second program algorithm to

implement genetic programming technique to generate album preference important values

indicating a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other. Guttman teaches

a genetic algorithm approach to produce the optimized publication layouts by generating and

evaluating a large number of possible layouts and selects the optimum layout (col. 3, lines 1-9)

using mutation (e.g., col. 7, lines 47-59) and cross-over functions (e.g., col. 8, lines 42-47). It

would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from

Guttman of applying genetic programming in Koba's system since the uses of a genetic

algorithm approach would have generated and evaluated, in a timely manner, a large number of

possible page layouts and selected optimum layout.

As per independent claim 2, Koba teaches an automated album layout method responsive

to a set of inputs containing digital images, graphics, and other 2-dimensional objects,

comprising the steps of:

receiving pluralities of user album preferences, said user album preferences indicating

parameter values including at least one of balance, emphasis, chronology and unity (col. 6, lines

7-42 and col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19).

generating a fitness function based upon said user album preferences (e.g., col. 6, lines

43-59);

evaluating a grouping of the image objects for distribution into a number of album pages

using a genetic algorithm, according to said fitness function (col. 6, lines 43-59);

assigning each image object to a page based on user preferences, including balance (col.

6, line 52 – col. 7, line 13);

displaying said page for user viewing, and refining the distribution based on said

evaluating (S210 of fig. 4 and fig. 5C and 5G).

Koba does not disclose the first program algorithm and the second program algorithm to

implement genetic programming technique to generate album preference important values

indicating a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other. Guttman teaches

a genetic algorithm approach to produce the optimized publication layouts by generating and

evaluating a large number of possible layouts and selects the optimum layout (col. 3, lines 1-9)

using mutation (e.g., col. 7, lines 47-59) and cross-over functions (e.g., col. 8, lines 42-47). It

would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from

Guttman of applying genetic programming in Koba's system since the uses of a genetic

algorithm approach would have generated and evaluated, in a timely manner, a large number of

possible page layouts and selected optimum layout.

As per independent claim 3, Koba teaches an automated layout and presentation method

responsive to a set of inputs containing digital images, graphics, and other two-dimensional

objects, comprising the steps of:

receiving pluralities of user album preferences, said user album preferences indicating

parameter values including at least one of balance, emphasis, chronology and unity (col. 6, lines

7-42 and col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19).

generating a fitness function based upon said user album preferences (e.g., col. 6, lines

43-59);

evaluating the `x' and `y' position coordinates, scale, and rotation of each of the input

images objects within a page using a genetic algorithm, according to said a fitness function (col.

7, lines 37-41);

creating a page layout based on said evaluating (col. 7, lines 37-41);

displaying said page layout for user viewing; refining said page layout based on further

user action (S210 of fig. 4 and fig. 5C and 5G), and formatting the page layout printing (col. 8,

lines 12-14).

Koba does not disclose the first program algorithm and the second program algorithm to

implement genetic programming technique to generate album preference important values

indicating a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other. Guttman teaches

a genetic algorithm approach to produce the optimized publication layouts by generating and

evaluating a large number of possible layouts and selects the optimum layout (col. 3, lines 1-9)

using mutation (e.g., col. 7, lines 47-59) and cross-over functions (e.g., col. 8, lines 42-47). It

would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from

Guttman of applying genetic programming in Koba's system since the uses of a genetic

algorithm approach would have generated and evaluated, in a timely manner, a large number of

possible page layouts and selected optimum layout.

As per independent claims 4, 5, and 6, they are rejected under the same rationale as claim

1.

As per independent claim 7, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4.

As per independent claim 8, Koba teaches a method of assigning a plurality of images,

having image parameters, to one or more pages in an album, comprising the steps of:

receive a set of images and user preferences and to generate album preference criteria

using said user preferences (e.g., col. 6, lines 43-59);

specifying an initial set of page assignments defining the album page assignment for each

of the plurality of images; initializing a population by assigning said initial set of page

assignments to genes within an album genome structure (col. 6, lines 43-45); evolving said

population in accordance with a program algorithm to produce a present set of page assignments

within said album genome structure (col. 6, lines 45-54);

calculating a present set of page criteria according to said present set of page

assignments, the image parameters, and a set of album page parameters; generating a fitness

function based upon said user album preferences (e.g., col. 6, lines 43-59); testing said present

set of page criteria according to an album fitness function to determine an album score; repeating

said evolving and calculating steps if said album score fails to meet an album threshold value,

and outputting image page assignments according to said present page assignment if said album

score meets said album threshold value (col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19).

Koba does not disclose the first program algorithm and the second program algorithm to

implement genetic programming technique to generate album preference important values

indicating a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other. Guttman teaches

a genetic algorithm approach to produce the optimized publication layouts by generating and

evaluating a large number of possible layouts and selects the optimum layout (col. 3, lines 1-9)

using mutation (e.g., col. 7, lines 47-59) and cross-over functions (e.g., col. 8, lines 42-47). It

would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from

Guttman of applying genetic programming in Koba's system since the uses of a genetic

algorithm approach would have generated and evaluated, in a timely manner, a large number of

possible page layouts and selected optimum layout.

As per claim 9, Koba teaches the image parameters include an image event value, image

chronology value, and image emphasis value (col. 6, lines 7-42).

As per independent claim 12, Koba teaches a method of assigning a plurality of images, having image parameters, to one or more pages in an album, comprising the steps of:

receiving pluralities of user album preferences, said user album preferences indicating parameter values including at least one of balance, emphasis, chronology and unity (col. 6, lines 7-42 and col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19).

specifying an initial set of page assignments defining the album page assignment for each of the plurality of images; initializing a population by assigning said initial set of page assignments to genes within an album genome structure (col. 6, lines 43-45); evolving said population in accordance with a program algorithm to produce a present set of page assignments within said album genome structure (col. 6, lines 45-54);

calculating a present set of page criteria according to said present set of page assignments, the image parameters, and a set of album page parameters; generating a fitness function based upon said user album preferences (e.g., col. 6, lines 43-59); testing said present set of page criteria according to an album fitness function to determine an album score; repeating said evolving and calculating steps if said album score fails to meet an album threshold value, and outputting image page assignments according to said present page assignment if said album score meets said album threshold value (col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19);

Koba does not disclose the first program algorithm and the second program algorithm to implement genetic programming technique to generate album preference important values indicating a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other. Guttman teaches a genetic algorithm approach to produce the optimized publication layouts by generating and evaluating a large number of possible layouts and selects the optimum layout (col. 3, lines 1-9)

using mutation (e.g., col. 7, lines 47-59) and cross-over functions (e.g., col. 8, lines 42-47). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Guttman of applying genetic programming in Koba's system since the uses of a genetic algorithm approach would have generated and evaluated, in a timely manner, a large number of possible page layouts and selected optimum layout.

As per claim 13, Koba teaches calculation of said page criteria includes calculation of an emphasis value range, a page count value, and a balance threshold value (col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19).

As per independent claim 14, Koba teaches a method of assigning a plurality of images, having image parameters, to one or more pages in an album, comprising the steps of:

receiving pluralities of user album preferences, said user album preferences indicating parameter values including at least one of balance, emphasis, chronology and unity (col. 6, lines 7-42 and col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19).

specifying an initial set of page assignments defining the album page assignment for each of the plurality of images; initializing a population by assigning said initial set of page assignments to genes within an album genome structure (col. 6, lines 43-45); evolving said population in accordance with a program algorithm to produce a present set of page assignments within said album genome structure (col. 6, lines 45-54);

calculating a present set of page criteria according to said present set of page assignments, the image parameters, and a set of album page parameters; generating a fitness

function based upon said user album preferences (e.g., col. 6, lines 43-59); testing said present set of page criteria according to an album fitness function to determine an album score; repeating said evolving and calculating steps if said album score fails to meet an album threshold value, and outputting image page assignments according to said present page assignment if said album score meets said album threshold value (col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19);

wherein said testing step further comprises the steps of: comparing said page criteria to preference criteria and generating a preliminary album score and scaling said preliminary album score in accordance with album importance parameters to produce a final album score (col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19).

Koba does not disclose the first program algorithm and the second program algorithm to implement genetic programming technique to generate album preference important values indicating a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other. Guttman teaches a genetic algorithm approach to produce the optimized publication layouts by generating and evaluating a large number of possible layouts and selects the optimum layout (col. 3, lines 1-9) using mutation (e.g., col. 7, lines 47-59) and cross-over functions (e.g., col. 8, lines 42-47). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Guttman of applying genetic programming in Koba's system since the uses of a genetic algorithm approach would have generated and evaluated, in a timely manner, a large number of possible page layouts and selected optimum layout.

As per claim 15, Koba teaches the page criteria include balance, emphasis, chronology, and unity (col. 6, lines 7-42 and col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19).

As per independent claim 17, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per independent claim 18, Koba teaches a method of arranging one, or more images, having image parameters, on an album page, comprising the steps of:

receiving pluralities of user album preferences, said user album preferences indicating parameter values including at least one of balance, emphasis, chronology and unity (col. 6, lines 7-42 and col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19).

specifying an initial set of positioning parameters for each of the one or more images; initializing a population by assigning said initial set of positioning parameters as genes in a page genome structure; evolving said population in accordance with a program algorithm to produce a present set of positioning parameters within said page genome structure (col. 7, lines 20-36);

calculating a set of present layout criteria, according to said present set of positioning parameters, the image parameters, and a set of page layout parameters; generating a fitness function based upon said user album preferences (e.g., col. 6, lines 43-59); testing said present set of layout criteria according to a page fitness function to determine a page score; repeating said evolving and calculating steps if said page score fails to meet a page threshold value (col. 7, lines 37-47); and

outputting a page layout according to said present set of positioning parameters if said page score meets said page threshold value (col. 8, lines 1-14).

Koba does not disclose the first program algorithm and the second program algorithm to implement genetic programming technique to generate album preference important values

indicating a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other. Guttman teaches

a genetic algorithm approach to produce the optimized publication layouts by generating and

evaluating a large number of possible layouts and selects the optimum layout (col. 3, lines 1-9)

using mutation (e.g., col. 7, lines 47-59) and cross-over functions (e.g., col. 8, lines 42-47). It

would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from

Guttman of applying genetic programming in Koba's system since the uses of a genetic

algorithm approach would have generated and evaluated, in a timely manner, a large number of

possible page layouts and selected optimum layout.

As per claim 19, Koba teaches the image parameters include an image emphasis value

(col. 7, lines 20-36).

As per claim 20, Koba teaches the genome structure is an array (the layouts of pictures as

in fig. 5F, for example, are arrays).

As per claim 21, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20.

As per independent claim 22, Koba teaches a method of arranging one, or more images,

having image parameters, on an album page, comprising the steps of:

receiving pluralities of user album preferences, said user album preferences indicating

parameter values including at least one of balance, emphasis, chronology and unity (col. 6, lines

7-42 and col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19).

specifying an initial set of positioning parameters for each of the one or more images;

initializing a population by assigning said initial set of positioning parameters as genes in a page

genome structure; evolving said population in accordance with a program algorithm to produce a

present set of positioning parameters within said page genome structure (col. 7, lines 20-36);

calculating a set of present layout criteria, according to said present set of positioning

parameters, the image parameters, and a set of page layout parameters; generating a fitness

function based upon said user album preferences (e.g., col. 6, lines 43-59); testing said present

set of layout criteria according to a page fitness function to determine a page score; repeating

said evolving and calculating steps if said page score fails to meet a page threshold value (col. 7,

lines 37-47); and

outputting a page layout according to said present set of positioning parameters if said

page score meets said page threshold value (col. 8, lines 1-14).

Koba does not disclose the first program algorithm and the second program algorithm to

implement genetic programming technique to generate album preference important values

indicating a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other. Guttman teaches

a genetic algorithm approach to produce the optimized publication layouts by generating and

evaluating a large number of possible layouts and selects the optimum layout (col. 3, lines 1-9)

using mutation (e.g., col. 7, lines 47-59) and cross-over functions (e.g., col. 8, lines 42-47). It

would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from

Guttman of applying genetic programming in Koba's system since the uses of a genetic

algorithm approach would have generated and evaluated, in a timely manner, a large number of

possible page layouts and selected optimum layout.

As per claim 23, Koba teaches the layout criteria includes calculation of image rotation (col. 6, lines 8-20 and col. 7, lines 37-41).

As per independent claim 24, Koba teaches a method of arranging one, or more images, having image parameters, on an album page, comprising the steps of:

receiving pluralities of user album preferences, said user album preferences indicating parameter values including at least one of balance, emphasis, chronology and unity (col. 6, lines 7-42 and col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19);

specifying an initial set of positioning parameters for each of the one or more images; initializing a population by assigning said initial set of positioning parameters as genes in a page genome structure; evolving said population in accordance with a program algorithm to produce a present set of positioning parameters within said page genome structure (col. 7, lines 20-36);

calculating a set of present layout criteria, according to said present set of positioning parameters, the image parameters, and a set of page layout parameters; generating a fitness function based upon said user album preferences (e.g., col. 6, lines 43-59); testing said present set of layout criteria according to a page fitness function to determine a page score; repeating said evolving and calculating steps if said page score fails to meet a page threshold value (col. 7, lines 37-47); and

outputting a page layout according to said present set of positioning parameters if said page score meets said page threshold value (col. 8, lines 1-14).

wherein said testing step further comprises the steps of: comparing said layout criteria to layout preference criteria and generating a preliminary page score and scaling said preliminary page score in accordance with page importance parameters to produce a final page score (col. 8, lines 1-14).

Koba does not disclose the first program algorithm and the second program algorithm to implement genetic programming technique to generate album preference important values indicating a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other. Guttman teaches a genetic algorithm approach to produce the optimized publication layouts by generating and evaluating a large number of possible layouts and selects the optimum layout (col. 3, lines 1-9) using mutation (e.g., col. 7, lines 47-59) and cross-over functions (e.g., col. 8, lines 42-47). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Guttman of applying genetic programming in Koba's system since the uses of a genetic algorithm approach would have generated and evaluated, in a timely manner, a large number of possible page layouts and selected optimum layout.

As per claim 25, Koba teaches the page criteria include white space range (col. 6, lines 8-20 and col. 7, lines 37-41).

As per claim 26, Koba teaches the layout preference criteria are based upon user preferences (col. 3, lines 56-61).

As per independent claim 27, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 28, Koba teaches repeating said evolving and testing steps if said album

score fails to meet said album threshold value (col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 19).

As per claim 29, since Koba's program algorithm implements Guttman's genetic

programming technique (Guttman, col. 3, lines 1-9), it is inherent in genetic programming to

have the genetic evolution calculations performed by at least one of the first and second genetic

engines include the application of a genetic mutation function.

As per claim 30, since Koba's program algorithm implements Guttman's genetic

programming technique (Guttman, col. 3, lines 1-9), it is inherent in genetic programming to

have the genetic evolution calculations performed by at least one of the first and second genetic

engines include the application of a genetic crossover function.

As per claim 31, since Koba's program algorithm implements Guttman's genetic

programming technique (Guttman, col. 3, lines 1-9), it is inherent in genetic programming to

have the step of evolving said genetic population includes the application of a genetic mutation

function.

As per claim 32, since Koba's program algorithm implements Guttman's genetic

programming technique (Guttman, col. 3, lines 1-9), it is inherent in genetic programming to

have the step of evolving said genetic population includes the application of a genetic crossover

function.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koba in

view of Guttman and further in view of Wang (US 6,014,458).

As per claim 10, Koba in view of Guttman does not disclose the genome structure is a

tree structure. Wang discloses hierarchical tree structure for arranging images in document pages

in and fig. 8, lines 27-45. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to

use the teaching from Wang of the genome structure is a tree structure in modified Koba's

system since it would allow a user to easily arrange and organize images in pages.

As per claim 11, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/26/2005 with respect to claim 1 have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that in Koba, the user inputs the degree of importance of each image along with preferences for various page assignment and layout criteria. This is unlike the claimed invention, in which importance values are not associated with individual images, but rather indicate a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other.

Koba does not teach importance values indicating a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other; However, as a combination between Koba and Guttman, Koba's system would have implemented Guttman's genetic algorithm technique of mutation (e.g., col. 7, lines 47-59) and cross-over functions (e.g., col. 8, lines 42-47) to evaluate importance values indicating a weighting of corresponding user preferences relative to each other. By doing this, Koba's system would have been improved the evaluating importance-values process by using Guttman's efficient genetic algorithm, instead of importance values are associated with individual images.

Inquiries

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-4139. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday with every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571)272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
January 9, 2006

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER